

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-27 remain in this application, with claims 14-16 being allowed.

The term referred to by the Examiner in section 2 on page 2 of the Office Action is eliminated above. All claims appearing above comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Independent claims 1, 21, and 24 are again rejected, along with certain dependent claims, as being unpatentable over the Porsche and Kanou documents relied on previously. Reconsideration is requested.

As amended above, each of independent claims 1, 21, and 24 particularly defines certain aspects of the shaping-in feature defined previously in claim 6. Neither the Porsche roof nor the Kanou roof includes an interior wall having a shaping-in as currently amended claims 1, 21, and 24 all define. It is, of course, noted that U.S. Patent 3,683,993 to Perks, relied on by the Examiner in section 6 on page 3 of the Office Action, includes a recess 17 adapted to hold an operating handle 31. The Perks recess 17, however, is provided in a front cross member 11 rather than in a roof interior wall as particularly defined. Rotation of the operating handle 31, moreover, produces interaction between a hook member 24 and a roof cross-member 27, and the recess 17 is thus not used for receiving a manual lever of a roof locking device interacting between the roof and a rollover bar section as defined in claims 1, 21, and 24.

For reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the Porsche, Kanou, and Perks disclosures, taken as a whole, do not suggest exterior and interior walls made of a high-strength plastic material, meeting or connecting only at edge zones of the roof, and extending at a mutual distance with respect to one another along a significant area delimited by inwardly expanded interior wall profilings, with the interior wall including a shaping-in used for receiving a manual lever of a roof locking device interacting between the roof and a rollover bar section of the car as independent claims 1, 21, and 24 define. The remaining secondary references discussed by the Examiner in sections 7-9 on pages 4-5 of the Office Action also do not suggest provision of features which would meet the limitations mentioned, and each of claims 1, 21, and 24 is considered patentable. The remaining, dependent claims of this application are considered patentable as well.

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of the application are again requested. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Date: September 30, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd